UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/565,013	01/18/2006	Johann Billiani	11885-00074-US	5442
	7590 03/27/200 OVE LODGE & HUT	EXAMINER		
PO BOX 2207		PEPITONE, MICHAEL F		
WILMINGTON, DE 19899			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1796	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/27/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/565,013	BILLIANI ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	MICHAEL PEPITONE	1796			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	lely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>18 Ja</u> This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This     Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrav  5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.  7) Claim(s) 8 is/are objected to.  8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or  Application Papers  9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner  10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the orecast application.	vn from consideration.  r election requirement.  r.  epted or b) □ objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is objected to by the drawing(s) is objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance.	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119  12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/18/06.	4)  Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5)  Notice of Informal P 6)  Other:	ite			

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Claim Objections

Claim 8 is objected to because it is dependent from claims 5 and 7.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 5 recites the limitation "the half-esters" in line 9. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-6 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Billiani *et al.* (US 5,698,625).

Application/Control Number: 10/565,013

Art Unit: 1796

Regarding claim 1: Billiani *et al.* teaches a water dilutable alkyd resin (1:39-2:11) comprising unsaturated fatty acids (3:7-12) which are bonded via ester groups (3:23-25) to a copolymer comprising vinyl monomers and alkyd resin (2:55-3:6; 3:13-19).

Page 3

Regarding claim 2: Billiani *et al.* teaches fatty acids in an amount of 30-70 wt% (2:55-3:6; 4:30-5:13).

Regarding claim 3: Billiani *et al.* teaches vinyl monomers comprising carboxyl groups in an amount of about 12 to 40% {as calculated by examiner} (1:39-2:11).

Regarding claim 4: Billiani *et al.* teaches unsaturated fatty acids in an amount of 25-50%, based on the amount of vinyl monomers (1:39-53).

Regarding claim 5: Billiani *et al.* teaches about 1 to 7% {as calculated by examiner} (meth)acrylate monomers comprising oxyalkylene groups (1:39-2:11; 2:32-44).

Regarding claim 6: Billiani *et al.* teaches the basic claimed composition [as set forth above with respect to claim 1].

The Office realizes that all the claimed effects or physical properties are not positively stated by the reference. However, the reference teaches all of the claimed reagents. Therefore, the claimed effects and physical properties, i.e. a hydroxyl number of 5-150 mg/g and a Staudinger index of 8 to 15 cm³/g, would inherently be achieved by a composition with all the claimed ingredients. If it is the applicants' position that this would not be the case: (1) evidence would need to be presented to support applicant's position; and (2) it would be the Office's position that the application contains inadequate disclosure that there is no teaching as to how to obtain the claimed properties and effects with only the claimed ingredients.

Regarding claim 9: Billiani *et al.* teaches emulsifying the neutralized alkyd resin in water (3:38-43; 4:20-26) for paint formulations (5:14-32).

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 7-8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Billiani *et al.* (US 5,698,625), as applied to claims 1 and 9 above.

Regarding claim 7: Billiani *et al.* teaches the basic claimed composition [as set forth with respect to claim 1] prepared by esterifying polyalcohols having 2-6 hydroxy groups, aromatic and/or aliphatic dicarboxylic acids, cyclic and/or polycyclic carboxylic acids, and unsaturated fatty acids (1:39-2:11; 3:23-37; 3:61-4:5; 4:11-16); and further reacting with a reaction product {a copolymer} comprising vinyl monomers having carboxyl groups, vinyl monomers without

hydroxyl nor acid groups, and free radical initiators (1:39-2:11; 3:23-37; 3:61-4:5; 4:11-16; 4:30-5:13), under esterification conditions to yield a water dispersible alkyd resin (3:23-37; 4:11-16; 4:30-5:13).

Page 5

Billiani *et al.* does not teach process steps in the same order of instant claim 7. However, a prima facie case of obviousness exists where changes in the sequence of adding ingredients derived from the prior art process steps. *Ex parte Rubin*, 128 USPQ 440 (Bd. App. 1959). See also *In re Burhans*, 154 F.2d 690, 69 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1946) (selection of any order of performing process steps is prima facie obvious in the absence of new or unexpected results); *In re Gibson*, 39 F.2d 975, 5 USPQ 230 (CCPA 1930) (Selection of any order of mixing ingredients is prima facie obvious.) [See MPEP 2144.04].

Regarding claim 8: Billiani *et al.* teaches (meth)acrylate monomers comprising oxyalkylene groups (1:39-2:11; 2:32-44).

Regarding claim 10: Billiani *et al.* teaches the basic claimed method [as set forth with respect to claim 9], wherein pigmented paints are prepared by dispersing pigments in the emulsion (3:44-51; 4:30-5:13).

Billiani *et al.* does not teach dispersing pigments prior to neutralization of the alkyd resin. However, a prima facie case of obviousness exists where changes in the sequence of adding ingredients derived from the prior art process steps. *Ex parte Rubin*, 128 USPQ 440 (Bd. App. 1959). See also *In re Burhans*, 154 F.2d 690, 69 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1946) (selection of any order of performing process steps is prima facie obvious in the absence of new or unexpected results); *In re Gibson*, 39 F.2d 975, 5 USPQ 230 (CCPA 1930) (Selection of any order of mixing ingredients is prima facie obvious.) [See MPEP 2144.04].

Application/Control Number: 10/565,013 Page 6

Art Unit: 1796

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicants'

disclosure. See attached form PTO-892.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to MICHAEL PEPITONE whose telephone number is (571)270-

3299. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 7:30-5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Mark Eashoo can be reached on 571-272-1197. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

**MFP** 

24-March-08

/David Wu/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1796